

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 4, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10-18 and 20.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1- 6 and 8-21 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,002); rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent. No. 5,847,792); rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Shimada et al. '571 (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,571); rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,781,253); and rejected claims 6, 8, 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,987) in view of Yoshino (U.S. Patent. No. 5,358,810) and Shimada et al. '830 (U.S. Patent No. 5,877,830).

The rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that Song et al. claims the benefits of foreign priority to a Korean application, and that the Korean application was published on April 30, 1998 with the publication number 1998-0010570.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...a black matrix, a color filter and a common electrode on a second transparent substrate, the black matrix being extended along the data line to overlap partially and asymmetrically with the data line..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 3, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

In addition, claims 2, 4, 5 and 21 are also allowable in that none of the cited references including Kobayashi et al., Shimada et al. '571 and Koike et al. cures the deficient teaching of Song et al.

The rejection of claims 6, 8, 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung in view of Yoshino and Shimada et al. '830 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 6 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 6 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the pixel electrode partially overlaps a second data line at a second end of the pixel electrode opposite to the first end and an overlap width between the pixel electrode and the second data line is less than 2 μ m." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, and claims 8-9 and 19, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

In the Office Action on page 12, the Examiner states, "Shimada discloses that the overlap width of the pixel electrode and the data line is about micrometer or more to perform a display without cross talk."

However, Applicants respectfully submit that according to claim 6, an overlap width between the pixel electrode and the second data line is less than 2 μ m, which means that an overlap width between the pixel electrode and the second data line could be less than 1 μ m. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimada et al. '830 teaches away from the teaching of the claimed invention.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant